

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 477 509

SP 041 591

AUTHOR Chambers, Sharon M.  
TITLE The Impact of Length of Student Teaching on the Self-Efficacy and Classroom Orientation of Pre-Service Teachers.  
PUB DATE 2003-00-00  
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association (San Antonio, TX, February 13-15, 2003).  
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)  
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS \*Classroom Techniques; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Secondary Education; \*Self Efficacy; \*Student Teaching; \*Teacher Effectiveness

## ABSTRACT

This study investigated whether the length of a teacher education program would affect student teachers' self-efficacy and classroom management beliefs, noting whether there were differences between students who had been in one semester versus two semesters of student teaching in regard to classroom management and self-efficacy beliefs. During the spring and fall semesters, 55 secondary teacher education students from a mid-sized Texas university participated in the study. Participants included 28 who were completing the traditional two-semester student teaching program and 27 who were completing the one-semester program. Students in the one-semester program had the same experiences as those in the two-semester program through an intensified semester. Near the end of the student teaching semesters, students completed two questionnaires, the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control Inventory and the Teacher Efficacy Scale. Data analysis indicated that there were no differences in the belief systems of students who participated in the two-semester versus one-semester programs. (Contains 23 references.) (SM)

TM TMTR  
0116  
SP

ED 477 509

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND  
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS  
BEEN GRANTED BY

**S. M. Chambers**

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

The Impact of Length of Student Teaching on the Self-Efficacy and Classroom Control  
Orientation of Pre-service Teachers

Sharon M. Chambers

Texas A&M University-Commerce

Paper presented at Southwest Educational Research Association, San Antonio, Tx

February 13-15

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP041591

### The Impact of Length of Student Teaching on the Self-Efficacy and Classroom Control Orientation of Pre-service Teachers

Because of the shortage of teachers in the nations' public schools, more teachers are needed to supply the demand. Teachers report that classroom management is one of the most difficult problems in education. Based on a framework developed by Wolfgang and Glickman (1980, 1986) there are three approaches to classroom interaction—non-interventionist, interventionist, and interactionalist. Non-interventionist classroom management is the least directive and controlling and they believe the child has intrinsic motivation and needs to be expressive. On the other hand, the interventionist is most controlling, and emphasizes more behavior modification practices. Mid-way between these two extremes is the interactionalist who strives to resolve issues that are satisfactory to both teacher and students. Bush and Achilles (1986) found that humanistic-authoritarianism personality characteristics are closely related to attitudes toward discipline. Their research indicated that humanistic methods of classroom management and discipline were more successful than authoritarian ones whose style of classroom control is a more harsh and ineffective approach. They found that when control was only suppressive and not corrective, it does not have educational value, and as a result, "violates principles of democracy, and has negative long-range effects both for the classroom learning environment and for the student personally" (13).

There are various classroom management strategies that have been developed and are known to be effective models taught in teacher education programs. (Emmer, 1986). Identification of classroom management style is important because it may be possible to change the style of classroom management of teachers who use more harsh approaches, such as the interventionist, and therefore help them become more effective in developing a

positive classroom learning climate that affects students' personal lives and learning. Teacher efficacy refers to a specific self-referent belief in a teacher's ability to organize and execute the actions necessary to reach certain attainments. Teacher self-efficacy has been found to be an important link with effective classroom management, teaching and learning (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Podell & Soodak, 1993; Tschannen-Moran, WoolfolkHoy, & Hoy, 1998; Henson, in press). Students of efficacious teachers have outperformed students of other teachers on a variety of achievement tests (Anderson, Greene, & Loewen, 1998; Moore & Esselman, 1992; Ross, 1992). Watson (1991) observed greater achievement in rural, urban, majority Black, and majority White schools for students of efficacious teachers. Regarding classroom management behaviors, efficacious teachers persist with struggling students and criticize less after incorrect student answers (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). They are also more likely to agree that a low SES student should be placed in a regular education setting and less likely to refer students for special education (Meijer & Foster, 1998; Podell & Soodak, 1993; Soodak & Podell, 1993). Teachers with high efficacy tend to experiment with methods of instruction, seek improved teaching methods and experiment with instructional materials (Allinder, 1994; Guskey, 1988; Stein & Wang, 1988). The idea that teacher's self-beliefs are determinants of teaching behavior is valuable information for educator programs.

Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) examined the relationship between preservice teachers' sense of efficacy and their beliefs of pupil control. Using the Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson & Dembo, 1984) and the Pupil Control Ideology form (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967), they reported that

Prospective teachers with high teaching efficacy are more humanistic in their pupil control ideology than those with low teaching efficacy; however, the relationship exists only among prospective teachers who believe that they have the ability to make a difference in student achievement-that is, only among those who also have high personal efficacy. (p 88)

It is possible, then, that perservice teachers who are confident in their capabilities display more humanistic, less interventionist, classroom management strategies. Because of the problem of enough teachers to fill classrooms with qualified teachers, quicker routes to teacher certification have emerged through emergency and alternative education programs; the question arises whether the length of time for preparation makes a difference in teacher self-efficacy and classroom control issues?

#### Purpose of the Study

Because of the potential role of efficacy beliefs in teachers' attitudes toward control in classroom management, the purpose of the present study is to examine differences in whether students participating in a one semester student teaching experience and students in a two semester student teaching experience change over time relative to teachers' efficacy beliefs on their classroom control orientation (Emmer, 1986; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). Second it is to compare the efficacy beliefs and classroom control orientation of the students who are participating in the traditional two-semester teacher education program and the students in the one-semester fast-track teacher education program.

The following research questions guide the study: a) Will the length of a teacher education program affect self-efficacy and classroom management beliefs of student teachers? b) Is there a difference between students who have been in one semester of

student teaching and those who have been in two semesters of student teaching in regards to classroom management and self-efficacy beliefs? c) Does the two-semester teacher education program have more influence on these beliefs than the one-semester teacher education program? d) Does time change classroom management beliefs, specifically of non-interventionist, interventionist, or interactionalist?

## Methodology

### *Participants and Procedures*

During the spring and fall university semesters 55 secondary teacher education students enrolled in a mid-sized university in Northeast Texas participated in the study. Participants included 28 students completing the traditional two-semester student teaching program and 27 students in the one-semester student teaching program. Students were administered two questionnaires during regularly scheduled classes near the end of the student teaching semesters.

The age variation between the one and two semester groups was minimal with 21 two semester students and 19 one semester students under the age of 30, with 7 two semester and 8 one semester students over the age of 30. There were 14 men in the two semester and 9 in the one semester group, with 14 women in the two semester and 18 in the one semester group. Fifteen of the two semester group and 11 of the one semester were located in rural communities, with 13 two semester and 16 one semester students located in an urban/suburban community.

When students were asked whether they had previous experience with children, such as camp counselor, church activities, and substitute teaching, 26 in the one and 26 in

the two semester group said, yes. However, 2 students in the two semester group and 1 student in the one semester group replied they had not. Both the one and two semester groups were made up of students whose teaching content was from various teaching fields and levels (see Table 1).

### *Two Semester Program*

The traditional two semester student teachers had completed the first semester of internship in the public schools spending two full days each week for 15 weeks participating in various teacher related activities such as lesson planning, micro-teaching, grading papers, classroom management, all under the mentorship of the regular classroom teacher and university supervisor. For these students the second semester, residency, was a typical student teaching experience.

### *One Semester Program*

In contrast, the one semester student teachers were given the same experiences as the two semester group in an intensified one semester. For example, the one semester group completed an internship phase in the first 6 weeks of the student teaching semester being in the schools everyday rather than 2 days a week. The coursework requirements were based on the same syllabus and followed the same standards/competencies. Although the hours of university coursework stayed approximately the same, the one semester students took coursework in 6 hour seminars rather than the normal college schedule. Both groups had completed the same coursework and classroom observation prior to the student teaching experiences.

### *Instrumentation*

The two instruments used were to assess students self-efficacy and classroom control orientation. The Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control Inventory (ABCC) (Martin, Yin, & Baldwin, 1998) assessed classroom control orientation. The ABCC includes 26 items with a 4-point Likert scale and proposes to measure three orthogonal dimensions of classroom management control: instructional, people, and behavioral management. Each scale was derived to assess a continuum of control (cf. Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980; Wolfgang, 1995) ranging from interventionist to interactionalist to non-interventionist, with interventionists expressing the greatest need/desire to control and manipulate the classroom environment. According to Martin, et. al. (1998, p 7), the instructional management scale (14 items) “includes aspects such as monitoring seatwork, structuring daily routines, and allocating materials,” the people management scale (8 items) “pertains to what teachers believe about students as persons and what teachers do to develop the teacher-student relationship,” and the behavioral management scale (4 items) “includes setting rules, establishing a reward structure, and providing opportunities for student input.” Although Martin, et. al. argued for a three factor orthogonal solution, the people and behavioral management factors had a moderate interfactor correlation ( $r = .484$ ) in their study and some items appear to share similar characteristics. Henson and Roberts (2001) also provided evidence of unity between these factors in a confirmatory factor analysis of the ABCC with preservice teachers. Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) revised 10-item version of Gibson and Dembo’s (1984) 16-item Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) will be used to measure personal and general teaching efficacy. Participants respond to a 7-point Likert scale anchored at “strongly agree” and “strongly disagree.” The revised



TES purports to measure two orthogonal dimensions: general teaching efficacy and personal teaching efficacy. Recent research reports that the TES general teaching efficacy really describes internal vs. external locus of control rather than outcome expectancy which was the original intent of the scale. Therefore, the 5-item personal teaching scale was used to measure a teacher's self-efficacy, which is a report of one's confidence in his or her ability to positively impact student learning.

## Results

Attitudes and Beliefs of Classroom Control Inventory Continuum. A score for each sub-scale is obtained by the summation of responses of all items in the dimension. Table 1 displays the items and their corresponding dimensions. According to the continuum originally suggested by Wolfgang and Glickman (1980, 1986), endorsement of an item reflects the degree of teacher power over students. High sub-scale scores indicate a more controlling, interventionist approach while lower scores are indicative of a less controlling belief in that dimension of classroom management style (Martin, Zin, & Baldwin, 1998).

Predicting Management and Efficacy Beliefs with One- vs. Two Semester Student Teaching. To determine if there were any differences between the one-semester and two-semester student teachers regarding classroom management three groups were evaluated based on the ABCC model, instructional management, people management, and behavior management (Martin, Yin, & Baldwin, 1998). Using a t-test to compare means, no significant differences were found in all three categories between the one- and two-

semester student teachers (see Table 2). Therefore, length of time in student teaching was not a predictor of any differences in classroom management and self-efficacy scores.

Further analysis using a simple regression procedure, length of time in student teaching was examined to note if there were any differences in classroom management and self-efficacy. Three subscale scores in ABCC, instructional management, people management, and behavioral management, were examined as predictors of TES as an indicated on the TES instrument. Using a simple regression procedure only one ABCC subscale, instructional management, would enter the regression equation and accounted for 16% of the variance in teacher self-efficacy ( $R^2 = .161$ ). Although it was found to be significant it is a weak predictor.

### Discussion

This study used the classroom management framework conceptualized by Wolfgang and Glickman (1980, 1986) to explain the various dimensions of classroom management. This framework defines three broad areas, instructional management, people management, and behavior management. Teachers' classroom management decisions vary according to their beliefs relative to the classroom management framework and "their endorsement of an item reflects the degree of teacher power over students" (Martin, Yin, & Baldwin, 1998, p. 3). High sub-scale scores reflect the teacher's degree of control, interventionist approach, and lower sub-scale scores indicate a less controlling belief about classroom management. It appears there is no difference in the belief system of students who participated in a one or two semester student teaching program.

## References

- Allinder, R. M. (1994). The relationships between efficacy and the instructional practices of special education teachers and consultants. Teacher Education and Special Education, 17, 86-95.
- Anderson, R., Greene, M., & Loewen, P. (1988). Relationships among teachers' and students' thinking skills, sense of efficacy, and student achievement. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 34(2), 148-165.
- Bush, D. W. & Achilles, C. M. (1986). Predicting effective disciplinary styles of teachers. Catalyst for Change, 15(3), 10-13.
- Emmer, E. (1986, December). Effects of Teacher Training in Disciplinary Approaches. Final draft of report submitted to the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC.
- Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 569-582.
- Glickman, C. D., & Tamashiro, R. T. (1980). Clarifying teachers' beliefs about discipline. Educational Leadership, 37, 459-464.
- Guskey, T. R. (1988). Teacher efficacy, self-concept, and attitudes toward the implementation of instructional innovation. Teaching and Teacher Education, 4, 63-69.
- Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. E. (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools. The Elementary School Journal, 93, 356-372.

- Henson, R. K., & Roberts, J. K. (2001, February). A confirmatory factor analysis of preservice teachers' responses to the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control Inventory. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, New Orleans. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. forthcoming)
- Martin, N. K., Yin, Z., Baldwin, B. (1998). Construct validation of the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control Inventory. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 33(2), 6-15.
- Meijer, C., & Foster, S. (1988). The effect of teacher self-efficacy on referral chance. Journal of Special Education, 22, 378-385.
- Moore, W., & Esselman, M. (1992, April). Teacher efficacy, power, school climate and achievement: A desegregating district's experience. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Podell, D., & Soodak, L. (1993). Teacher efficacy and bias in special education referrals. Journal of Educational Research, 86, 247-253.
- Ross, J. A. (1992). Teacher efficacy and the effect of coaching on student achievement. Canadian Journal of Education, 17(1), 51-65.
- Soodak, L., & Podell, D. (1993). Teacher efficacy and student problems as factors in special education referral. Journal of Special Education, 27, 66-81.
- Stein, M. K., & Wang, M. C. (1988). Teacher development and school improvement: The process of teacher change. Teaching and Teacher Education, 4, 171-187.

- Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. Review of Educational Research, 68, 202-248.
- Watson, S. (1991). A study of the effects of teacher efficacy on academic achievement of third-grade students in selected elementary schools in South Carolina. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, South Carolina State College, Orangeburg. (University Microfilms No. UMI 9230552)
- Willower, D. J., Eidell, T. L., & Hoy, W. K. (1967). The school and pupil control ideology. (Penn State Studies Monograph No. 24). University Park: Pennsylvania State University.
- Wolfgang, C. H. (1995). Solving discipline problems: Strategies for classroom teachers (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Wolfgang, C.H., & Glickman, C.D. (1980). Solving discipline problems: Strategies for classroom teachers. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Wolfgang, C.H., & Glickman, C.D. (1985). Solving discipline problems: Strategies for classroom teachers (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Woolfolk, A. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82, 81-91.

Table 1

## Characteristics of the One vs. Two Semester Groups

Track	Gender	Location	Experience	Level
One	9 M	16 urban/sub	26 yes	2 (6-8)
	18 F	11 rural	1 no	20 (9-12)
				5 (All)
Two	14 M	13 urban/sub	26 yes	4 (6-8)
	14 F	15 rural	2 no	15 (9-12)
				9 (All)

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for One vs. Two Semester Student Teacher Groups

Variable	Track	N	M	SD
Instructional	One	27	43.0	4.42
	Two	27	44.7	4.46
People	One	27	45.2	3.37
	Two	27	45.7	2.91
Behavior	One	27	20.5	1.52
	Two	27	21.2	1.53
TES	One	26	25.4	3.46
	Two	26	26.1	3.30

Table 1

## Characteristics of the One vs. Two Semester Groups

Track	Gender	Location	Experience	Level
One	9 M	16 urban/sub	26 yes	2 (6-8)
	18 F	11 rural	1 no	20 (9-12)
				5 (All)
Two	14 M	13 urban/sub	26 yes	4 (6-8)
	14 F	15 rural	2 no	15 (9-12)
				9 (All)



Table 2

## Descriptive Statistics for One vs. Two Semester Student Teacher Groups

Variable	Track	N	M	SD
Instructional	One	27	43.0	4.42
	Two	27	44.7	4.46
People	One	27	45.2	3.37
	Two	27	45.7	2.91
Behavior	One	27	20.5	1.52
	Two	27	21.2	1.53
TES	One	26	25.4	3.46
	Two	26	26.1	3.30



U.S. Department of Education  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)  
National Library of Education (NLE)  
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



## REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

**AERA**

### I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: <i>The Impact of length of student teaching on the Self-efficacy and classroom control Orientation of Pre-Service Teachers</i>	
Author(s): <i>Sharon M. Chambers</i>	
Corporate Source: <i>Texas A&amp;M University - Commerce</i>	Publication Date: <i>2003</i>

### II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY  <i>Sample</i>  TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
--

1

Level 1



Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY. HAS BEEN GRANTED BY  <i>Sample</i>  TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
---

2A

Level 2A



Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY  <i>Sample</i>  TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
---

2B

Level 2B



Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.  
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign  
here, →  
please

Signature: <i>Sharon M. Chambers</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: <i>Sharon M. Chambers, Assistant Professor</i>
Organization/Address: <i>Texas A&amp;M University - Commerce</i> <i>P.O. Box 3011</i> <i>Commerce, TX 75429</i>	Telephone: <i>903-886-5604</i> E-Mail Address: <i>Sharon.Chambers@tamuc.edu</i>
	FAX: <i>903-886-5603</i> Date: <i>2/14/03</i>

(Over)

### III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

### IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

### V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

**ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION  
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND  
1129 SHRIVER LAB  
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701  
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS**

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

**ERIC Processing and Reference Facility**

**4483-A Forbes Boulevard  
Lanham, Maryland 20706**

**Telephone: 301-552-4200**

**Toll Free: 800-799-3742**

**FAX: 301-552-4700**

**e-mail: [ericfac@inet.ed.gov](mailto:ericfac@inet.ed.gov)**

**WWW: <http://ericfacility.org>**